1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON			
10	AT TACOMA			
11	ELDORADO BROWN,	CASE NO. C13-5367 RBL-JRC		
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'		
13	v.	MOTION TO STRIKE DECLARATION OF DR. GINZLER, PH.D		
14	WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS et al.,			
15	Defendants.			
16	The District Court has referred this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action to United States			
17	Magistrate Judge J. Richard Creatura pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and (B), and local			
18	Magistrate Judge Rules MJR1, MJR3 and MJR4.			
19	Defendants move to strike the declaration of Dr. Joshua Ginzler, Ph.D. filed in support of			
20	plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment (Dkt. 74) on the grounds that Dr. Ginzler's			
21	testimony was not disclosed prior to discovery cut-off and because his testimony was not based			
22	on scientifically valid or acceptable methodology as required by <i>Daubert v. Merrill Dow</i>			
23	Pharmaceutical, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993) (Dk	ct. 77, pp. 8-9). Plaintiff responded to the motion		
24				

to strike by stating that the Court's scheduling order did not set a date for disclosure of expert witnesses and in the absence of such an order, such disclosures were not required until ninety days before the date set for trial. *See* FRCP 26(a)(2)(D)(i). Since no trial date had been set, plaintiff argues that it was not required to designate experts or submit a report. Further, plaintiff argues that Dr. Ginzler had sufficient qualifications to render opinions and based his opinion on a review of records, plaintiff's response to interviews, and testing (Dkt. 81, pp. 4-5).

Timeliness of plaintiff's disclosure. Proceedings involving prisoner cases are often subject to special scheduling. Most often, plaintiffs are not represented by counsel, nor are experts involved in the cases. As a result, the standard scheduling order that applies to most prisoner cases, and that was used in this case, does not address the disclosure of expert witnesses. In this case, however, expert opinions have been offered in response to, and in support of, motions for summary judgment. The Court recognizes the shortcomings of its own standard scheduling order in this case. Furthermore, although defendants argue in their brief that plaintiff did not submit information in response to defendants' interrogatories, defendants have not supported the motion to strike with any evidence of specific interrogatories or responses that plaintiff failed to answer in a timely manner. In light of the lack of a deadline in the scheduling order and in the absence of any other evidence of plaintiff's failure to disclose this expert opinion in response to a timely interrogatory or request for production, Dr. Ginzler's report would be subject to the time limitations of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)(D)(i) -- which would be ninety days before the date set for trial. Since no trial date has been set in this case, the report and the opinion would not have been untimely.

The *Daubert* test. Regarding defendants' general objection to Dr. Ginzler's opinions, the Court notes that Dr. Ginzler is licensed to practice psychology in the state of Washington and

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	bases his opinion on evaluations of plaintiff, testing, and his review of records (Dkt. 74, pp. 1, 3).	
2	Therefore, generally, Dr. Ginzler's testimony is not inadmissible because of his lack of	
3	qualifications or factual basis. Because defendants do not identify specific opinions that do not	
4	meet the <i>Daubert</i> test, but rather move to strike the entire declaration, the Court will evaluate the	
5	admissibility of each of Dr. Ginzler's opinions in the context of the Report and Recommendation	
6	regarding the respective motions for summary judgment filed by plaintiff and defendants.	
7	For the foregoing reasons, defendants' motion to strike Dr. Ginzler's declaration is	
8	DENIED.	
9	Dated this 5 <sup>th</sup> day of March, 2015.	
10	I May de Jugare	
11	J. Richard Creatura	
12	United States Magistrate Judge	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		